

**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COMMITTEE**

March 20, 2019 at 1:00 p.m.
MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room
2700 Port Lansing Road
Lansing, Michigan
MINUTES

****Frequently Used Acronyms Attached**

Members Present:

Bill McEntee, CRA – Chair
Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS

Jonathan Start, MTPA/KATS
Jennifer Tubbs, MTA

Support Staff Present:

Niles Annelin, MDOT
Gil Chesbro, MDOT
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS
Tim Lauxmann, DTMB/CSS
Gloria Strong, MDOT

Roger Belknap, MDOT, via Telephone
Tim Colling, LTAP/MTU, via Telephone
Dave Jennett, MDOT
Tim Lemon, MDOT

Members Absent:

Bob Slattery, MML

Public Present:

Douglas Adelman, MDOT, via Telephone
Karen Howe, MDOT
Ryan Minkus, Kalamazoo County via Telephone
Aaron Verhelle, RCOC, via Telephone

Jim Hoekstra, Kalamazoo County, via Telephone
Rachel Jones, RCOC, via Telephone
Craig Newell, MDOT

1. Welcome – Call-to-Order – Introductions:

The meeting was called-to-order at 1:05 p.m. Everyone was introduced and welcomed to the meeting.

2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:

None

3. Consent Agenda:

3.1. – Approval of February 20, 2019 Data Committee Meeting Minutes – *Action Item* (Attachment 1)

Motion: J. Start made a motion to approve the February 20, 2019 meeting minutes; J. Tubbs seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

3.2. – TAMC Budget Update (Attachment 2)

An updated financial report (03/15/2019) was provided to the committee. First quarter invoices are steadily coming in. They are still working on calculating how much funding is available from the Culvert Pilot Project funds.

4. Traffic Signal Pilot Efforts – B. McEntee (Attachment 3):

The Committee needs to determine which data elements for traffic signals need to be collected and placed in the TAMC IRT. B. McEntee shared a list of traffic signal data elements that he feels TAMC may want to request the agencies to collect. He requested that the committee review the list he provided, select the elements that they feel would be required for the agencies to collect, place those elements on two lists – one high priority list and the other a lower priority list, then circulate the lists to committee members for review and comment. At the April 24, 2019

Data Committee meeting the revised list will be reviewed and discussed. TAMC should include the cost of installation. They may be only interested in assets costing \$20,000 or more. It was suggested that the Committee put the lists in order by cost impact also. Some agencies such as Oakland, Kalamazoo, Grand Rapids, already have traffic signal data. Smaller agencies may not have the level of detail as larger road commissions. There are many agencies that already collect traffic signal data and TAMC may be able to get the majority of the data they need from what is already collected. Some of the data elements that were suggested during the meeting were: intersection name, location, pole type, number of poles, number of spans, expected replacement date, ownership, and adding in Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Adding in the ADA requirements will up the costs of modernization and/or replacement.

Action Item: All committee members must review the list that B. McEntee has provided and place the elements that they feel should be collected by the agencies in two lists, one high priority level and the other lower priority, share their lists with all committee members, then be prepared to discuss at the April 24, 2019 Data Committee meeting.

5. Presentations – 2018 PASER Data Analysis, Quality Review and Forecast – G. Chesbro:

G. Chesbro presented on the 2018 PASER Federal Aid Road data analysis and charts that he prepared for the annual report. Some counties collect data yearly and others do it every other year, so the amount of data collected from year to year changes. There has not been a large change in the condition from 2016/2017 to 2017/2018. G. Chesbro created graphs for 2015/2016 and 2017/2018 that showed the percent of lane miles that went from good to fair, fair to poor, and some poor up to fair, and some fair up to good. He also gave a review of the paved non-federal aid roads, but this is not representative of all the paved non-federal aid roads.

G. Chesbro shared graphs for the 2018 annual report model summary for both trunkline and non-trunkline sides and reviewed the data with the committee. The forecasted revenue data and past years forecasted data brought on much discussion due to significant increase in revenue in 2015. K. Howe reviewed the past few years' worth of data with the committee and explained why there was a significant difference for 2016. J. Start and J. Tubbs want more information as to why there is such a big difference in 2016 than in previous and recent years. J. Start wants to be sure he understands so he can give a clear description of why the data is different. According to K. Howe, it was because there was a significant increase in revenue during that time.

6. Review and Discussion Items:

6.1. – 2018 TAMC Annual Report Update – D. Jennett

Work on the annual report is going well. The IRT data sets are being completed. Information regarding Public Act 325, which addresses the requirement of Asset Management Plans, will be included in the report. D. Jennett is reviewing some of the new graphs that will be added into the report and will forward those graphs to the Data Committee for their review. They will be expanding on the accomplishments and incorporating items such as the Culvert Pilot Project. This information will also be sent to the Data Committee for their review once completed.

6.1.1. – PASER Reporting and Forecasts

Once the graphs are completed they will be forwarded to the Data Committee for their review.

6.1.2. – Investment Reporting Summaries

These reports will also be shared with the committee once they are completed.

6.2. – Data Requests – R. Belknap and B. McEntee

6.2.1. – March 7, 2019 Request from Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) (Attachment 4)

An emailed data request was received by R. Belknap on March 7, 2019, from SEMCOG for a shapefile of road conditions throughout Michigan for federal aid roads only. They are only interested in specific fields within the IRT. The Data Committee decided to allow CSS to complete this data request.

Motion: J. Start made a motion to authorize CSS to provide the requested data to SEMCOG; J. Tubbs seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

6.2.2. – March 14, 2019 Request from the Michigan Road Preservation Association (MRPA) (Attachment 5)

An emailed data request was received by R. Belknap on March 14, 2019, from MRPA, for follow up data from an initial project that was first discussed in November 2009 and presented to legislators in August 2010. Updates were made to the maps and charts as a result of their request in 2012. They are now requesting a map of pavement conditions from 2012-2018 showing the changes in good/fair/poor by legislative regions. CSS estimates that it will take them 120-160 hours to complete this request at the cost of \$12,000-\$16,000. TAMC can request reimbursement of costs for this data request per TAMC's data request policy. The Data Committee would like support staff to request reimbursement from MRPA for this request and the request to be treated as a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. The other option is for MRPA to get the information from the TAMC dashboards themselves. But because they need this data by legislative regions, CSS will need to assist with this request. R. Belknap will inform MRPA of the committee's decision and let them know the cost to provide this data request through the FOIA. This request will not go on to full Council for review and approval.

Action Item: R. Belknap will contact MRPA and inform them of the committee's decision to process this as a FOIA. If MRPA decides to go forward with doing the FOIA, R. Belknap will process the request via the FOIA process.

6.3. – Update on Paving Warranties and the TAMC IRT – B. McEntee

T. Colling recently requested that they hold a meeting after today's Data Committee meeting to discuss these subjects. TAMC support staff worked with County Road Association (CRA) to develop a warranty compliance report. In order to capture all pertinent warranty information, it was decided to add some additional questions in the IRT. T. Colling spoke with Steve Puuri, PE, at the County Road Association Conference, regarding warranties and Monday sent out a list of warranty questions to CRA associates. T. Colling shared those responses with the group. They currently have enough data regarding warranties on pavement (asphalt, concrete, or composite) projects over \$2 million in pavement to get CSS started on uploading the warranties in the IRT. MTU just got the contract to develop the training and has training coming up for non-technical (via a video or PowerPoint), elected/appointed city and county officials around July/August, and a more technical training for people handling the warranties will be done via on-site training around November/December. There are currently a few warranties already in the IRT that CSS will review for 2018/2019 projects.

Action Item: CSS will provide a listing of the current warranties in the IRT from 2018/2019 to the Data Committee.

6.4. – Investment Reporting Compliance Review Update – R. Belknap (Attachment 6)

R. Belknap provided an updated report on investment reporting compliance as of March 15, 2019 for committee review.

6.5. – Investment Reporting: Review Process Requirements for Future Projects Data and Three-year Plan Requirements – R. Belknap

CSS has begun making a "map view" function to display data by regions within the IRT and has completed a three-year project report. CSS will provide the report to the committee for their review. The estimated hours of completion for the report was 72 hours. The estimated hours for the map are 40-50 hours. The Committee would like CSS to proceed with the completion of the map per their previous request. The funds

used for these projects are already available in the current CSS budget and will not affect TAMC's current budget and will not affect other CSS work.

6.6. –Work Program: Target Estimated Costs/Priorities by April – R. Belknap (Attachment 7)

Support staff is developing a list of discussion topics for the June 5, 2019, Strategic Planning Session. It is requested that the committee review their section of the newly formatted work program provided, identify what they feel are high priority tasks, forward those to TAMC support staff by April, and be prepared to discuss at the June session. Budgeting of tasks will also be discussed. It was suggested that TAMC and the regions work with the smaller agencies to find out where they stand with an Asset Management Plan (not required of the smaller agencies), PASER data collection on the local road systems, planned projects, traffic signals and warranties. B. McEntee and J. Start felt it would be a good idea to ask if LTAP could do a mix-and-fix analysis projection using project cost, condition the system this year, and life cycle wheel data currently maintained by TAMC. B. McEntee would also like to know what would happen if we doubled the investment on 4s and 5s and, doubled the investment on heavy CPM on 5s and 6s. What would the system look like in three years? He is hoping to find funding to assist LTAP to work on this task.

6.7. – CSS Website/Dashboard/IRT Update – C. Granger

C. Granger provided a list of tasks that CSS is currently working on for TAMC:

1. CSS is close to wrapping up the RPOs and MPOs functions to the dashboards.
2. The warranty and three-year projects are still in process.
3. They will have some discussions after today's meeting with those involved with getting the culvert data into the IRT. They still need to know the multiple treatment types. R. Belknap will ask the ADARS staff about their ability to handle multiple treatment types but feels more conversation needs to be had regarding this.
4. The TAMC bridge condition dashboards are static and are not updated like the MDOT system which is updated on a regular basis. CSS needs the Bridge Committee to provide them with the bridge conditions on a regular basis in order to keep the TAMC bridge condition dashboards up-to-date.

7. Public Comments:

None

8. Member Comments:

The Data Committee scheduled meetings were reviewed.

9. Adjournment:

Motion: J. Start made a motion to adjourn the meeting; J. Tubbs seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present. The meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m. The next TAMC Data Committee meeting is scheduled for April 24, 2019, at 1:00 p.m., MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room, 2700 Port Lansing Road, Lansing.

TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS:	
AASHTO	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS
ACE	ADMINISTRATION, COMMUNICATION, AND EDUCATION (TAMC COMMITTEE)
ACT-51	PUBLIC ACT 51 OF 1951-DEFINITION: A CLASSIFICATION SYTEM DESIGNED TO DISTRIBUTE MICHIGAN'S ACT 51 FUNDS. A ROADWAY MUST BE CLASSIFIED ON THE ACT 51 LIST TO RECEIVE STATE MONEY.
ADARS	ACT 51 DISTRIBUTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM
BTP	BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (MDOT)
CPM	CAPITAL PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE

CRA	COUNTY ROAD ASSOCIATION (OF MICHIGAN)
CSD	CONTRACT SERVICES DIVISION (MDOT)
CSS	CENTER FOR SHARED SOLUTIONS
DI	DISTRESS INDEX
ESC	EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE
FAST	FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT
FHWA	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FOD	FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (MDOT)
FY	FISCAL YEAR
GLS REGION V	GENESEE-LAPEER-SHIAWASSEE REGION V PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
GVMC	GRAND VALLEY METRO COUNCIL
HPMS	HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM
IBR	INVENTORY BASED RATING
IRI	INTERNATIONAL ROUGHNESS INDEX
IRT	INVESTMENT REPORTING TOOL
KATS	KALAMAZOO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY
KCRC	KENT COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION
LDC	LAPTOP DATA COLLECTORS
LTAP	LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
MAC	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
MAP-21	MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21 ST CENTURY (ACT)
MAR	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF REGIONS
MDOT	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MDTMB	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
MIC	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE COUNCIL
MITA	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION
MML	MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
MPO	METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MTA	MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION
MTF	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION FUNDS
MTPA	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ASSOCIATION
MTU	MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
NBI	NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY
NBIS	NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS
NFA	NON-FEDERAL AID
NFC	NATIONAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
NHS	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
PASER	PAVEMENT SURFACE EVALUATION AND RATING
PNFA	PAVED NON-FEDERAL AID
PWA	PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION
QA/QC	QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL
RCKC	ROAD COMMISSION OF KALAMAZOO COUNTY
RCOC	ROAD COMMISSION OF OAKLAND COUNTY
ROW	RIGHT-OF-WAY
RPA	REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RPO	REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SEMCOG	SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STC	STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
STP	STATE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
TAMC	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
TAMCSD	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUPPORT DIVISION
TAMP	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN
TPM	TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES

UWP	UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM
WAMC	WATER ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

S:/GLORIASTRONG/TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS.11.2018.GMS